arXiv:1510.04711v1 [quant-ph] 15 Oct 2015

Universal steering inequalities

Huangjun Zhu,[1,2,*] Masahito Hayashi,[3,4,†] and Lin Chen[5,6,‡]

[1] *Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada*
[2] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, Cologne 50937, Germany*
[3] *Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-0814, Japan*
[4] *Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117543, Singapore*
[5] *School of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*
[6] *International Research Institute for Multidisciplinary Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*

(Dated: October 19, 2015)

We propose a general framework for constructing universal steering criteria that are applicable to arbitrary bipartite states and measurement settings of the steering party. The same framework is also useful for studying the joint measurement problem. Based on the data-processing inequality for an extended Rényi relative entropy, we then introduce a family of universal steering inequalities, which detect steering much more efficiently than those inequalities known before. As illustrations, we show unbounded violation of a steering inequality for assemblages constructed from mutually unbiased bases and establish an interesting connection between maximally steerable assemblages and complete sets of mutually unbiased bases. We also provide a single steering inequality that can detect all bipartite pure states of full Schmidt rank. In the course of study, we generalize a number of results intimately connected to data-processing inequalities, which are of independent interest.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta

Steering is a nonclassical phenomenon that formalizes what Einstein called "spooky action at a distance" [1, 2]. For a long time, it was studied under the name of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) paradox [3–5]. Recently, it was realized that steering is a form of nonlocality that sits between entanglement and Bell nonlocality [6–9] and that is intrinsically asymmetric [10, 11]. Interestingly, steering can be characterized by a simple quantum information processing task, namely, entanglement verification with an untrusted party [6, 7]. In addition, steering has been found useful in a number of applications, such as subchannel discrimination [12] and one-sided device-independent quantum key distribution [13].

Recently, detection and characterization of steering have attracted increasing attention [4–7, 12, 14–21]. Various steering criteria and inequalities have been derived, such as linear steering inequalities [14, 17]; inequalities based on multiplicative variances [4, 5, 14], entropic uncertainty relations [15, 16], fine-grained uncertainty relations [18]; and hierarchy of steering criteria based on moments [19]. However, most of these results are tailored to deal with specific scenarios; majority criteria are only applicable to given numbers of measurement settings and outcomes. In addition, many criteria (including most linear criteria) rely heavily on numerical optimization and lack a clear physical meaning and simple interpretation.

In this paper, we propose a general framework for constructing universal steering criteria that are applicable to arbitrary measurement settings of the steering party. In particular, we introduce nonlinear steering inequalities based on the data-processing inequality for an extended Rényi relative entropy [22, 23], which detect steering more systematically and efficiently than criteria in the literature. The same framework is also useful for studying the joint measurement problem [24–29]. In addition, our inequalities have a clear information theoretic meaning and simple interpretation. As illustrations of the general framework, we show unbounded violation of a steering inequality by virtue of *mutually unbiased bases* (MUB) [30, 31] and establish an interesting connection between maximally steerable settings and complete sets of MUB. We also provide a single steering inequality that can detect all bipartite pure states of full Schmidt rank.



FIG. 1. Steering scenario. Alice can affect Bob's state via her choice of the measurement according to the relation $\rho_{a|x} = \mathrm{tr}_A[(A_{a|x} \otimes 1)\rho]$. Entanglement is necessary but not sufficient for steering.

Suppose Alice and Bob share a bipartite state ρ with reduced states ρ_A and ρ_B. Alice can perform local measurements described by a collection of positive-operator-valued measures (POVMs) $\{A_{a|x}\}$, which is known as a *measurement assemblage*. If Alice obtains outcome a for measurement x, then the unnormalized reduced state of Bob is $\rho_{a|x} = \mathrm{tr}_A[(A_{a|x} \otimes 1)\rho]$. In the following, we discuss steering of Bob's system by Alice's measurements in terms of Bob's states $\rho_{a|x}$. The set of states $\rho_{a|x}$ for a given x is called an *ensemble* for ρ_B, and the whose collection of ensembles is called a *state assemblage* [17];

see Fig. 1. To distinguish them, we express the ensemble by $\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a$ and the state assemblage by $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$. The assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ is steerable if it does not admit a local hidden state model [6, 7] as $\rho_{a|x} = \sum_\lambda p(a|x,\lambda)\sigma_\lambda$ for all a, x, where $\{\sigma_\lambda\}$ is an ensemble for ρ_B and $p(a|x,\lambda)$ are a collection of stochastic maps with $p(a|x,\lambda) \geq 0$ and $\sum_a p(a|x,\lambda) = 1$. The state ρ is steerable from Alice to Bob if there exists a measurement assemblage for Alice such that the resulting state assemblage for Bob is steerable. In this paper we shall focus on steerability of assemblages, no matter how they are constructed.

The steering problem is closely related to the joint measurement problem of POVMs [26–29, 32]. Up to a scaling, a POVM may be seen as an ensemble for the completely mixed state. A measurement assemblage is *compatible* or *jointly measurable* if the corresponding state assemblage (for the completely mixed state) is unsteerable. In view of this connection, many results on steering can be turned into corresponding results on POVMs, and vice versa. We shall make use of this connection without further comments whenever convenient.

To set up the stage, we need to introduce suitable order relations on ensembles and assemblages. Given two ensembles $\{\rho_a\}$ and $\{\sigma_b\}$ for ρ_B, which may represent two preparation procedures, the ensemble $\{\rho_a\}$ is a *coarse graining* of $\{\sigma_b\}$, denoted by $\{\rho_a\} \preceq \{\sigma_b\}$ or $\{\sigma_b\} \succeq \{\rho_a\}$, if the former can be derived from the latter by data processing, that is, $\rho_a = \sum_b p(a|b)\sigma_b$, where the stochastic map $p(a|b)$ characterizes the data-processing procedure. In that case, $\{\sigma_b\}$ is a *refinement* of $\{\rho_a\}$. Intuitively, coarse graining usually leads to a less informative ensemble. Two ensembles are *equivalent* if they are coarse graining (refinement) of each other. The relation of coarse graining (refinement) forms a partial order on equivalent classes of ensembles for a given state.

The order relation on ensembles can be generalized to assemblages in a natural way. Given two assemblages $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{b|y}\}$ for ρ_B, the assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ is a coarse graining of $\{\sigma_{b|y}\}$, denoted by $\{\rho_{a|x}\} \preceq \{\sigma_{b|y}\}$ or $\{\sigma_{b|y}\} \succeq \{\rho_{a|x}\}$, if each ensemble in $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ is a coarse graining of an ensemble in $\{\sigma_{b|y}\}$. In that case, $\{\sigma_{b|y}\}$ is called a refinement of $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$. An assemblage is unsteerable if and only if it has a refinement that contains only one ensemble, that is, all its ensembles possess a common refinement. By definition, any coarse graining of an unsteerable assemblage is unsteerable. Conversely, any refinement of a steerable assemblage is steerable.

A function f on ensembles is *order monotonic* (or order preserving) if $f(\{\rho_a\}) \preceq f(\{\sigma_b\})$ whenever $\{\rho_a\} \preceq \{\sigma_b\}$. Order-monotonic functions on assemblages can be defined in a similar manner. Here the image of f could be any space with a partial order, although we use the same notation for the partial order as that on ensembles. The image of all ensembles for a given state under an order-monotonic function f is called the *complementarity chamber* and denoted by $\mathcal{C}_f$. In those cases of interest to us, the chambers are usually finite-dimensional compact convex sets, and their shapes reflect the information tradeoff among different ensembles, hence the name. For any unsteerable assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ with a common refinement, say, $\{\sigma_\lambda\}$, we have $f(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a) \preceq f(\{\sigma_\lambda\}) \in \mathcal{C}_f$ for all x. So $f(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$ have a common upper bound in $\mathcal{C}_f$. Violation of this condition is a signature of steerability; see Fig. 2 for an illustration.



FIG. 2. (color online) Simple idea behind universal steering criteria. Here the green cone at $\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$ represents the set of superoperators $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathcal{F} \geq \mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$. When the assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ is unsteerable, $\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$ have a common upper bound in the complementarity chamber (left plot). Violation of this condition implies steerability (right plot).

To unleash the potential of the idea spelled out above, it is essential to construct order-monotonic functions that are easy to characterize. Inspired by the data-processing inequality for a Rényi relative entropy [22, 23], here we introduce two such functions from ensembles to superoperators. Let Q be a positive operator of full rank; define

$$\mathcal{G}_Q(\{\rho_a\}) := \sum_a \frac{|\rho_a\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\rho_a|}{\mathrm{tr}(Q\rho_a)}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(\{\rho_a\}) := \sum_a \frac{|\bar{\rho}_a\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\bar{\rho}_a|}{\mathrm{tr}(Q\rho_a)}, \tag{1}$$

where $\bar{\rho}_a = \rho_a - \mathrm{tr}(\rho_a)/d$ and d is the dimension of the Hilbert space. Here, we consider the Hilbert space of operators on the physical space, i.e., the Hilbert-Schmidt space. The kets in this space are denoted by the double-ket notation to distinguish them from ordinary kets. Superoperators, such as the outer product $|A\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle B|$, act on the operator space just as ordinary operators act on the usual Hilbert space; for example $(|A\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle B|)|C\rangle\!\rangle = |A\rangle\!\rangle\,\mathrm{tr}(B^\dagger C)$ (cf. [29, 33]).

Now, for a positive real vector $\boldsymbol{p}$ and a real vector $\boldsymbol{v}$ of the same length, we introduce extended Rényi relative entropy of order 2 as $D_2(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p}) := \log\sum_k \frac{v_k^2}{p_k}$, which reduces to the conventional Rényi relative entropy of order 2 when $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ represent probability distributions [22, 23]. As shown in the supplementary material, the extended Rényi relative entropy obeys the data-processing inequality, from which we deduce the following theorem.

Theorem 1. The functions $\mathcal{G}_Q(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(\cdot)$ are order monotonic for any positive operator Q of full rank.

When Q is the identity, Eq. (1) reduces to

$$\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_a\}) := \sum_a \frac{|\rho_a\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\rho_a|}{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_a)}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_a\}) := \sum_a \frac{|\bar{\rho}_a\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\bar{\rho}_a|}{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_a)}. \tag{2}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_a\})) &= \sum_a \frac{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_a^2)}{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_a)} \le \sum_a \mathrm{tr}(\rho_a) = 1, \\ \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_a\})) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_a\})) - \frac{1}{d} \le 1 - \frac{1}{d}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where "Tr" denotes the trace of superoperators. Here the upper bounds are saturated if and only if the ensemble is rank 1, that is, all the ρ_a have rank 1. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) &= \min\{\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{F}) | \mathcal{F} \ge \mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)\ \forall x\}, \\ \bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) &= \min\{\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{F}) | \mathcal{F} \ge \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)\ \forall x\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Theorem 2. The functions $\tau(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\tau}(\cdot)$ are order-monotonic on assemblages. Any unsteerable assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ satisfies $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le 1$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le 1 - 1/d$. Any compatible measurement assemblage $\{M_{a|x}\}$ satisfies $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d - 1$.

Proof. Suppose $\{\rho_{a|x}\} \preceq \{\sigma_{b|y}\}$. Then for any ensemble x in $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ there exists an ensemble y in $\{\sigma_{b|y}\}$ such that $\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a) \le \mathcal{G}(\{\sigma_{b|y}\}_b)$ according to Theorem 1. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} \ge \mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$ for all x whenever $\mathcal{F} \ge \mathcal{G}(\{\sigma_{b|y}\}_b)$ for all y. It follows that $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le \tau(\{\sigma_{b|y}\})$ and $\tau(\cdot)$ is order-monotonic. By the same reasoning, so is $\bar{\tau}(\cdot)$.

The ensembles in $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ possess a common refinement, say $\{\sigma_\lambda\}$, so that $\mathcal{G}(\{\sigma_\lambda\}) \ge \mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$ for all x. On the other hand, $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{G}(\{\sigma_\lambda\})) \le 1$ according to Eq. (3). It follows that $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le 1$. The other three inequalities in Theorem 2 follow from the same reasoning. □

Remark 1. According to Proposition 4 in the supplementary material, $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) = \bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) + 1/d$, so the inequalities $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le 1$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le 1 - 1/d$ are equivalent; so are $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d - 1$. In practice, one may be easier to analyze than another.

Figure 2 depicts the simple idea behind steering inequalities in Theorem 2. These inequalities means that unsteerable (compatible) assemblages cannot be too informative (cf. Ref. [29]). Compared with steering inequalities in the literatures [14, 17], what is remarkable is that they are applicable to arbitrary assemblages and the bounds can be derived without numerical optimization. The values of $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ can be computed efficiently with semidefinite programming (SDP), whose size increases only linearly with the number of ensembles. Although the steerability of an assemblage can be determined by SDP [17, 20], the size of such SDP increases exponentially with ensembles. Our approach is attractive from both conceptual and practical perspectives.

To illustrate the application of our steering inequalities, we need to introduce several concepts. Two ensembles $\{\rho_a\}$ and $\{\sigma_b\}$ are *mutually orthogonal* if $\mathrm{tr}(\bar{\rho}_a\bar{\sigma}_b) = 0$ for all a, b or, equivalently, if $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_a\})$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\sigma_b\})$ have mutually orthogonal support. The same definition applies to POVMs. For POVMs corresponding to rank-1 projective measurements, orthogonality is equivalent to mutually unbiasedness. Recall that two bases $\{|\psi_j\rangle\}$ and $\{|\varphi_k\rangle\}$ in dimension d are mutually unbiased if $|\langle\psi_j|\varphi_k\rangle|^2 = 1/d$ for all j, k [30, 31]. The following two propositions are proved in the supplementary material.

Proposition 1. Any measurement assemblage $\{M_{a|x}\}$ satisfies $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d^2$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d^2 - 1$. Any state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ satisfies $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le d$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le d - 1/d$.

Proposition 2. Any measurement assemblage $\{M_{a|x}\}$ with m POVMs satisfies $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le m(d-1)$. Any state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ with m ensembles satisfies $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le m(1 - 1/d)$. The upper bound is saturated if and only if the POVMs (ensembles) are rank 1 and mutually orthogonal.

In view of Proposition 1, measurement assemblages saturating the upper bound $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d^2 - 1$ (or $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d^2$) are called maximally incompatible; state assemblages saturating $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le d - 1/d$ (or $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le d$) are called maximally steerable.

When a measurement assemblage $\{M_{a|x}\}$ is composed of m projective measurements, the upper bound $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le m(d-1)$ is saturated if and only if the bases are mutually unbiased. So measurement assemblages composed of MUB are maximally incompatible for given m; accordingly, state assemblages constructed from MUB are maximally steerable. The inequality $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d^2 - 1$ in Proposition 1 means that each set of MUB can contain at most $d + 1$ bases, in agreement with the well-known bound [30, 31]. When d is a prime power, a complete set of MUB can be constructed [30, 31], so the compatibility inequality $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \le d-1$ and the steering inequality $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le 1-1/d$ can be violated by a factor of $d+1$, which is unbounded as d grows. In contrast with the unbounded violation of a linear steering inequality shown in Ref. [34], our result follows from a universal recipe, and the degree of violation can be determined precisely. An intriguing problem left open is how many bases are needed to construct a maximally incompatible (steerable) assemblage when complete sets of MUB cannot be found, say in dimension 6.

Next, we generalize Theorem 2 by virtue of the order-monotonic functions $\mathcal{G}_Q$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q$. Define superoperator $\mathcal{R}_Q$ [29, 33, 35, 36] and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q$ by the equation

$$\mathcal{R}_Q|S\rangle\!\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|SQ + QS\rangle\!\rangle, \quad \bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q = \mathcal{R}_Q - \frac{|Q\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle Q|}{\mathrm{tr}(Q)}. \tag{5}$$

Note that both $\mathcal{R}_Q$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q$ are positive superoperators,

that is, $\langle\!\langle S|\mathcal{R}_Q|S\rangle\!\rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle\!\langle S|\bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q|S\rangle\!\rangle \geq 0$ for any operator S; so $\mathcal{R}_Q^{1/2}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q^{1/2}$ are well defined. Here comes the analogy of Eq. (3),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{R}_Q\mathcal{G}_Q(\{\rho_a\})) &= \sum_a \frac{\mathrm{tr}(Q\rho_a^2)}{\mathrm{tr}(Q\rho_a)} \leq \sum_a \mathrm{tr}(\rho_a) = 1,\\ \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(\{\rho_a\})) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{R}_Q\mathcal{G}_Q(\{\rho_a\})) - \frac{\mathrm{tr}(Q\rho_B)}{\mathrm{tr}(Q)}\\ &\leq 1 - \frac{\mathrm{tr}(Q\rho_B)}{\mathrm{tr}(Q)}.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Again, the upper bounds are saturated if and only if the ensemble is rank 1. The operator Q serves as a probe. If $Q = 1$, then $\mathcal{R}_Q = \mathbf{I}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q = \bar{\mathbf{I}}$, where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity superoperator and $\bar{\mathbf{I}}$ is the projector onto the space of traceless operators, so Eq. (6) reduces to Eq. (3). Define

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_Q(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) &= \min\{\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{F})|\mathcal{F} \geq \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_Q(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)\ \forall x\},\\ \bar{\tau}_Q(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) &= \min\{\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{F})|\mathcal{F} \geq \tilde{\bar{\mathcal{G}}}_Q(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)\ \forall x\},\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_Q = \mathcal{R}_Q^{1/2}\mathcal{G}_Q\mathcal{R}_Q^{1/2}$ and $\tilde{\bar{\mathcal{G}}}_Q = \bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q^{1/2}\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q\bar{\mathcal{R}}_Q^{1/2}$. By the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 2, we have

Theorem 3. The functions $\tau_Q(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\tau}_Q(\cdot)$ are order-monotonic on assemblages for any invertible positive operator Q. Any unsteerable state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ satisfies $\tau_Q(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \leq 1$ and $\bar{\tau}_Q(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \leq 1 - \mathrm{tr}(Q\rho_B)/\mathrm{tr}(Q)$. Any compatible measurement assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ satisfies $\tau_Q(\{M_{a|x}\}) \leq d$ and $\bar{\tau}_Q(\{M_{a|x}\}) \leq d-1$.

To illustrate the power of Theorem 3, let us consider a measurement assemblage $\{M_{a|x}\}$ composed of two different symmetric informationally complete measurements (SICs) [37, 38]. Since SICs form 2-designs and tight informationally complete measurements [33, 39–41], we have $\mathcal{G}(\{M_{a|1}\}_a) = \mathcal{G}(\{M_{a|2}\}_a) = (\mathbf{I} + |1\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle 1|)/(d+1)$ and $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) = d$. If Q is a generic quantum state, then $\mathcal{G}_Q(\{M_{a|1}\}_a) \neq \mathcal{G}_Q(\{M_{a|2}\}_a)$, so that $\tau_Q(\{M_{a|x}\}) > d$. In this case, the inequalities in Theorem 3 can detect incompatibility (steering) that cannot be detected by Theorem 2 thanks to the choice in the probe Q.

More general steering inequalities can be derived by considering the effect of filtering. The following proposition is an easy generalization of a result in Ref. [28].

Proposition 3. The two assemblages $\{V\rho_{a|x}V^\dagger\}$ and $\{V\rho_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}V^\dagger\}$ (unnormalized) are both unsteerable for any operator V if $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ is unsteerable. When V is invertible, $\{V\rho_{a|x}V^\dagger\}$, $\{V\rho_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}V^\dagger\}$, and $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ are simultaneously steerable or not.

When Bob's state ρ_B is invertible, Theorem 3 and Proposition 3 imply that any unsteerable assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ satisfies

$$\tau_Q(\{\rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_{a|x}\rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}) \leq d, \quad \bar{\tau}_Q(\{\rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_{a|x}\rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}) \leq d-1. \tag{8}$$

Until now, we discuss steering in terms of Bob's state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$. At this point, it is instructive to consider steering of Bob's state by Alice's measurements as described by the assemblage $\{A_{a|x}\}$, which is the physical situation illustrated in Fig. 1. Suppose they share a pure bipartite state ρ of full Schmidt rank, which has the Schmidt decomposition $\rho = \sum_{j,k}\lambda_j\lambda_k|jj\rangle\langle kk|$. Then the reduced states of Alice and Bob have the same form with respect to the Schmidt basis $\rho_A = \rho_B = \sum_j \lambda_j^2|j\rangle\langle j|$, and the state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ for Bob takes on the form $\rho_{a|x} = \rho_B^{1/2}A_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}\rho_B^{1/2}$ [23, 28]. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_Q(\{\rho_B^{-1/2}\rho_{a|x}\rho_B^{-1/2}\}) &= \tau_Q(\{A_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}\}),\\ \bar{\tau}_Q(\{\rho_B^{-1/2}\rho_{a|x}\rho_B^{-1/2}\}) &= \bar{\tau}_Q(\{A_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}\}).\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

As a consequence of Eqs. (8) and (9), $\tau(\{A_{a|x}\}) \leq d$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{A_{a|x}\}) \leq d-1$ if Alice cannot steer Bob's system, note that $\tau(\{A_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}\}) = \tau(\{A_{a|x}\})$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{A_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}\}) = \bar{\tau}(\{A_{a|x}\})$ according to Lemma S6 in the supplementary material. If the assemblage $\{A_{a|x}\}$ is composed of two MUB, then $\bar{\tau}(\{A_{a|x}\}) = 2(d-1)$, which violates the second inequality by a factor of 2. Remarkably, the single steering inequality $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_{a|x}\rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}) \leq d-1$ with two measurement settings can detect the steerability of all bipartite pure states of full Schmidt rank, whereas infinitely many inequalities linear in $\rho_{a|x}$ (note that our inequalities are not linear in $\rho_{a|x}$) are needed to achieve the same task [14, 17]. Also, no general recipe is known for constructing linear steering inequalities without numerical optimization. Therefore, our approach provides a dramatic improvement over those alternatives known in the literatures. Further, an additional example on isotropic states is presented in the supplementary material.

In summary, we proposed a general framework for detecting and characterizing steering based on simple information theoretic ideas. Based on the data-processing inequality for the extended Rényi relative entropy of order 2, we then introduced a family of universal steering inequalities that are applicable to arbitrary assemblages and have a simple interpretation. As illustrations, we showed unbounded violation of a steering inequality for assemblages constructed from MUB and provided a single steering inequality that can detect all bipartite pure states of full Schmidt rank. Our work established intriguing connections among a number of fascinating subjects, including information theory, quantum foundations, and geometry of quantum state space, which are of interest to researchers from diverse fields. In addition, our work has an intimate connection to quantum estimation theory. Indeed, our Theorem 1 can be applied to prove the data-processing inequality for Fisher information, and vice versa (cf. the supplementary material). Also, our study allows to derive and generalize many results in quantum estimation theory, which will be presented in another paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

HZ is grateful to Matthew Pusey and Joshua Combes for comments and discussions. This work is supported by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through Industry Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research and Innovation. HZ also acknowledges financial support from the Excellence Initiative of the German Federal and State Governments (ZUK 81) and the DFG. MH is partially supported by a MEXT Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) No. 23246071 and the National Institute of Information and Communication Technology (NICT), Japan. The Centre for Quantum Technologies is funded by the Singapore Ministry of Education and the National Research Foundation as part of the Research Centres of Excellence programme. LC was supported by the NSF of China (Grant No. 11501024), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant Nos. 30426401 and 30458601).

* Corresponding Author: hzhu@pitp.ca
† masahito@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp
‡ linchen@buaa.edu.cn

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
[2] E. Schrödinger, Math. Proc. Cambr. Philos. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935).
[3] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
[4] M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 913 (1989).
[5] M. D. Reid, P. D. Drummond, W. P. Bowen, E. G. Cavalcanti, P. K. Lam, H. A. Bachor, U. L. Andersen, and G. Leuchs, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1727 (2009).
[6] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140402 (2007).
[7] S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052116 (2007).
[8] D. J. Saunders, S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, and G. J. Pryde, Nat. Phys. **6**, 845 (2010).
[9] M. T. Quintino, T. Vértesi, D. Cavalcanti, R. Augusiak, M. Demianowicz, A. Acín, and N. Brunner, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 032107 (2015).
[10] S. L. W. Midgley, A. J. Ferris, and M. K. Olsen, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022101 (2010).
[11] J. Bowles, T. Vértesi, M. T. Quintino, and N. Brunner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 200402 (2014).
[12] M. Piani and J. Watrous, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 060404 (2015).
[13] C. Branciard, E. G. Cavalcanti, S. P. Walborn, V. Scarani, and H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 010301 (2012).
[14] E. G. Cavalcanti, S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, and M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 032112 (2009).
[15] S. P. Walborn, A. Salles, R. M. Gomes, F. Toscano, and P. H. Souto Ribeiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 130402 (2011).
[16] J. Schneeloch, C. J. Broadbent, S. P. Walborn, E. G. Cavalcanti, and J. C. Howell, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 062103 (2013).
[17] M. F. Pusey, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 032313 (2013).
[18] T. Pramanik, M. Kaplan, and A. S. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 050305 (2014).
[19] I. Kogias, P. Skrzypczyk, D. Cavalcanti, A. Acin, and G. Adesso, "Hierarchy of Steering Criteria Based on Moments for All Bipartite Quantum Systems," (2015), arXiv:1507.04164.
[20] P. Skrzypczyk, M. Navascués, and D. Cavalcanti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 180404 (2014).
[21] I. Kogias, A. R. Lee, S. Ragy, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 060403 (2015).
[22] A. Rényi, in *Proc. Symp. Math., Stat. Probability* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1961) pp. 547–561.
[23] M. Hayashi, *Quantum Information: An Introduction* (Springer, Berlin, 2006).
[24] P. Busch, T. Heinonen, and P. Lahti, Phys. Rep. **452**, 155 (2007).
[25] T. Heinosaari and M. M. Wolf, J. Math. Phys. **51**, 092201 (2010).
[26] M. T. Quintino, T. Vértesi, and N. Brunner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 160402 (2014).
[27] R. Uola, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 160403 (2014).
[28] R. Uola, C. Budroni, O. Gühne, and J.-P. Pellonpää, "A one-to-one mapping between steering and joint measurability problems," (2015), arXiv:1507.08633.
[29] H. Zhu, Sci. Rep. **5**, 14317 (2015).
[30] W. K. Wootters and B. D. Fields, Ann. Phys. **191**, 363 (1989).
[31] T. Durt, B.-G. Englert, I. Bengtsson, and K. Życzkowski, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **8**, 535 (2010).
[32] M. F. Pusey, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **32**, A56 (2015).
[33] H. Zhu, *Quantum State Estimation and Symmetric Informationally Complete POMs*, Ph.D. thesis, National University of Singapore (2012), available at `http://scholarbank.nus.edu.sg/bitstream/handle/10635/35247/ZhuHJthesis.pdf`.
[34] M. Marciniak, A. Rutkowski, Z. Yin, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, "Unbounded violation of steering inequalities for binary output," (2015), arXiv:1411.5994.
[35] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).
[36] D. Petz and C. Sudár, J. Math. Phys. **37**, 2662 (1996).
[37] G. Zauner, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **9**, 445 (2011).
[38] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 2171 (2004).
[39] A. J. Scott, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39**, 13507 (2006).
[40] H. Zhu and B.-G. Englert, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 022327 (2011).
[41] D. M. Appleby, C. A. Fuchs, and H. Zhu, Quantum Inf. Comput. **15**, 61 (2015).
[42] I. Csiszár, Studia Scient. Math. Hungar. **2**, 299 (1967).
[43] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, and U. M. Maurer, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **41**, 1915 (1995).
[44] J. Håstad, R. Impagliazzo, L. A. Levin, and M. Luby, SIAM J. Comput. **28**, 1364 (1999).
[45] R. Zamir, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **44**, 1246 (1998).
[46] J. Combes, C. Ferrie, Z. Jiang, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 052117 (2014).
[47] C. Ferrie, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 014101 (2014).

Supplementary material: Universal steering inequalities

In this supplementary material we prove Theorem 1 in the main text by proving the data-processing inequality for the extended Rényi relative entropy of order 2. We also explain the connection between Theorem 1 and generalized data-processing inequalities for generalized relative entropies as well as the data-processing inequality for Fisher information. Quite surprisingly, Theorem 1 embodies a generalization of two distinct data-processing inequalities. This observation reveals an intriguing connection between the Rényi relative entropy and Fisher information, which deserves further study. In addition, we derive an equality between $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$, and prove Propositions 1 and 2 in the main text, which are needed for determining maximally steerable assemblages. We also show that the functions $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ introduced in the main text are invariant under transposition of $\rho_{a|x}$. Finally, we consider the steerability of isotropic states as another illustration of our approach.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof. Let $A = \{A_k\}$ and $B = \{B_j\}$ be two sets of positive operators that satisfy $B_j = \sum_k \Lambda_{jk} A_k$ for an arbitrary stochastic matrix Λ. Let C be an arbitrary Hermitian operator; then

$$\langle\!\langle C|\mathcal{G}_Q(A)|C\rangle\!\rangle = \sum_k \frac{v_k^2}{p_k}, \quad \langle\!\langle C|\mathcal{G}_Q(B)|C\rangle\!\rangle = \sum_j \frac{u_j^2}{q_j}, \tag{S1}$$

where $p_k = \mathrm{tr}(QA_k)$, $q_j = \mathrm{tr}(QB_j)$, $v_k = \mathrm{tr}(A_k C)$, and $u_j = \mathrm{tr}(B_j C)$ satisfy $q_j = \sum_k \Lambda_{jk} p_k$ and $u_j = \sum_k \Lambda_{jk} v_k$. According to Lemma S1 below, $\langle\!\langle C|\mathcal{G}_Q(B)|C\rangle\!\rangle \leq \langle\!\langle C|\mathcal{G}_Q(A)|C\rangle\!\rangle$, which implies that $\mathcal{G}_Q(B) \leq \mathcal{G}_Q(A)$ and $\mathcal{G}_Q(\cdot)$ is order monotonic. By the same token, so is $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(\cdot)$. Alternatively, the latter conclusion follows from the observation that $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(\cdot) = \bar{\mathbf{I}}\mathcal{G}_Q(\cdot)\bar{\mathbf{I}}$. □

Remark S1. $\{A_k\}$ and $\{B_j\}$ in the above proof are not necessarily normalized assemblages as long as they are connected by a stochastic matrix. Therefore, Theorem 1 is applicable for both normalized and unnormalized assemblages.

Let $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ be two real vectors of the same length and $p_k > 0$ for all k. Following the main text, the extended Rényi relative entropy of order 2 between the two vectors is defined as $D_2(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p}) := \log \sum_k \frac{v_k^2}{p_k}$.

Lemma S1. Given two real vectors $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ as above, let $\boldsymbol{q} = \Lambda\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{u} = \Lambda\boldsymbol{v}$, where Λ is a stochastic matrix. Then $D_2(\boldsymbol{u}\|\boldsymbol{q}) \leq D_2(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p})$, that is,

$$\sum_j \frac{u_j^2}{q_j} \leq \sum_k \frac{v_k^2}{p_k}. \tag{S2}$$

Proof. The proof follows the same idea as in the proof of data-processing inequalities for generalized relative entropies [23, 42]. It relies on the convexity of the quadratic function.

$$\sum_j \frac{u_j^2}{q_j} = \sum_j q_j \left(\sum_k \frac{\Lambda_{jk} p_k}{q_j} \frac{v_k}{p_k}\right)^2 \leq \sum_j q_j \sum_k \frac{\Lambda_{jk} p_k}{q_j} \left(\frac{v_k}{p_k}\right)^2 = \sum_k \frac{v_k^2}{p_k}, \tag{S3}$$

note that $\{\frac{\Lambda_{jk} p_k}{q_j}\}_k$ forms a probability distribution. □

Remark S2. Here we assume that no row of Λ are identically 0, so that $q_j > 0$ for all j.

When $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{p}$ are probability distributions, $D_2(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p})$ is Rényi relative entropy of order 2, which obeys a well-known data-processing inequality [22, 23]. In Lemma S1, the four vectors $\boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}$ are not necessarily probabilities as long as the components of $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{q}$ are positive. Therefore, Eq. (S2) may be understood as a generalization of the data-processing inequality for Rényi relative entropy of order 2. Although this relative entropy and its variant play important roles in information theory and cryptography theory [43, 44], we are not aware of the extension of the quantity $\log \sum_k \frac{v_k^2}{p_k}$ and Eq. (S2) for general vectors in the literature. Our work may stimulate further progress along this direction.

GENERALIZED DATA-PROCESSING INEQUALITIES

In this section, we explore potential extension of our approach based on generalized data-processing inequalities. Let f be a convex function defined on real numbers; let $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ be two real vectors of the same length such that $p_k > 0$ for all k. Define the extended f-relative entropy as

$$D_f(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p}) = \sum_k p_k f\Big(\frac{v_k}{p_k}\Big). \tag{S4}$$

Theorem S1. $D_f(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p})$ is monotonic under data processing for any convex function f, that is,

$$D_f(\Lambda\boldsymbol{v}\|\Lambda\boldsymbol{p}) \leq D_f(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p}) \tag{S5}$$

for any stochastic matrix Λ.

Remark S3. This theorem can be proved using Jensen's inequality for a convex function according to the same reasoning as in the proof of Lemma S1 (cf. Refs. [23, 42]).

When $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are probability distributions, $D_f(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p})$ is known as the f-relative entropy (f-divergence) between $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$. It quantifies the closeness between the two probability distributions, which is intimated connected to mutual information. In that case, Eq. (S5) reduces to the data-processing inequality (also known as information-processing inequality) for f-relative entropy; cf. Ref. [23, 42]. In addition, we can relax the requirement on f to be a convex function defined over positive numbers. When $f(x) = x\log x$, $D_f(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p})$ reduces to the usual relative entropy, and Eq. (S5) represents the well known data-processing inequality for the relative entropy. When $f(x) = x^2$, $\log D_f(\boldsymbol{v}\|\boldsymbol{p})$ coincides with the Rényi relative entropy of order 2, and Eq. (S5) takes on the same form as Eq. (S2).

In our application, v_k may take on negative values (this is the case for $v_k = \mathrm{tr}(A_k C)$ in the proof of Theorem 1), so it is desirable to choose the function f that can accept a negative entry such as $f(x) = x^2$. This is the reason we introduce the extended f-relative entropy. Other potential choices include the quartic function $f(x) = x^4$. We leave it open whether such functions can be used to construct steering inequalities.

CONNECTION WITH THE DATA-PROCESSING INEQUALITY FOR FISHER INFORMATION

In this section, we explain the connection between the order-monotonic functions $\mathcal{G}_Q(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(\cdot)$ in Theorem 1 and Fisher information with regard to the data-processing inequality [45]. Consider a random variable A as the outcome of a measurement or observation. Suppose A takes on values over positive integers and the probability of obtaining outcome j is $p_A(j|\theta)$, where θ is the unknown parameter. The *Fisher information* associated with A is given by

$$I_A(\theta) = \sum_j p_A(j|\theta)\Big(\frac{\partial \ln p_A(j|\theta)}{\partial\theta}\Big)^2 = \sum_j \frac{1}{p_A(j|\theta)}\Big(\frac{\partial p_A(j|\theta)}{\partial\theta}\Big)^2. \tag{S6}$$

Lemma S2. Suppose A, B are two random variables with joint distribution $p(j,k|\theta)$. Then the total Fisher information provided by the two random variables is given by

$$I_{A,B}(\theta) = I_A(\theta) + I_{B|A}(\theta), \tag{S7}$$

where

$$I_{B|A}(\theta) = \sum_{j,k} p(j,k|\theta)\left(\frac{\partial \ln p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)}{\partial\theta}\right)^2 \tag{S8}$$

is the conditional Fisher information, and $p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)$ is the conditional probability distribution.

Remark S4. This chain rule for Fisher information and the data-processing inequality in Theorem S2 below were derived in Ref. [45] (in a slightly different form).

Proof.

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{A,B}(\theta) &= \sum_{j,k} p(j,k|\theta)\Big(\frac{\partial \ln p(j,k|\theta)}{\partial\theta}\Big)^2 = \sum_{j,k} p(j,k|\theta)\bigg(\frac{\partial \ln p_A(j|\theta)}{\partial\theta} + \frac{\partial \ln p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)}{\partial\theta}\bigg)^2 \\
&= \sum_{j,k} p(j,k|\theta)\bigg[\bigg(\frac{\partial \ln p_A(j|\theta)}{\partial\theta}\bigg)^2 + \bigg(\frac{\partial \ln p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)}{\partial\theta}\bigg)^2\bigg] + 2\sum_{j,k} p(j,k|\theta)\frac{\partial \ln p_A(j|\theta)}{\partial\theta}\frac{\partial \ln p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)}{\partial\theta} \\
&= I_A(\theta) + I_{B|A}(\theta),
\end{aligned} \tag{S9}
$$

where in deriving the last equality, we have employed the following equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,k} p(j,k|\theta)\frac{\partial \ln p_A(j|\theta)}{\partial\theta}\frac{\partial \ln p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)}{\partial\theta} \\
&= \sum_j \bigg(p_A(j|\theta)\frac{\partial \ln p_A(j|\theta)}{\partial\theta}\sum_k p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)\frac{\partial \ln p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)}{\partial\theta}\bigg) \\
&= \sum_j \bigg(p_A(j|\theta)\frac{\partial \ln p_A(j|\theta)}{\partial\theta}\sum_k \frac{\partial p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta)}{\partial\theta}\bigg) = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{S10}
$$

note that $\sum_k p_{B|A}(k|j;\theta) = 1$. □

Theorem S2. Suppose A, B are two random variables whose marginal distributions satisfy $p_B(j|\theta) = \sum_k \Lambda_{jk} p_A(k|\theta)$, where Λ is a stochastic matrix independent of the parameter θ. Then $I_B(\theta) \le I_A(\theta)$.

This theorem is an immediate consequence of Lemma S2, given that $I_{B|A}(\theta) = 0$ since the conditional probability distribution $p_{B|A}$ is independent of θ.

In the rest of this section we show that the superoperators $\mathcal{G}_Q(A)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(A)$ introduced in the main text may be understood as Fisher information matrices in superoperator form when Q is a quantum state and $A = \{A_k\}$ is a POVM. Note that $\mathrm{tr}(QA_k)$ is the probability of obtaining outcome A_k upon measuring A on Q and that

$$
\mathcal{G}_Q(A) = \sum_k \frac{|A_k\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle A_k|}{\mathrm{tr}(QA_k)}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(A) = \sum_k \frac{|\bar{A}_k\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle \bar{A}_k|}{\mathrm{tr}(QA_k)}. \tag{S11}
$$

Suppose Q is a quantum state that depends on the parameter θ. Then the Fisher information concerning θ provided by the measurement A is

$$
I_A(\theta) = \sum_k \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}(QA_k)}\,\mathrm{tr}\Big(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial\theta}A_k\Big)^2 = \Big\langle\!\Big\langle \frac{\partial Q}{\partial\theta}\Big|\mathcal{G}_Q(A)\Big|\frac{\partial Q}{\partial\theta}\Big\rangle\!\Big\rangle = \Big\langle\!\Big\langle \frac{\partial Q}{\partial\theta}\Big|\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(A)\Big|\frac{\partial Q}{\partial\theta}\Big\rangle\!\Big\rangle, \tag{S12}
$$

where the third equality follows from the fact that $\partial Q/\partial\theta$ is traceless. Therefore, $\mathcal{G}_Q(A)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_Q(A)$ are Fisher information matrices in disguise, and Theorem 1 in the main text embodies generalized data-processing inequalities for Fisher information. As an implication of our result, the Fisher information data-processing inequality is also valid for incomplete observations or measurements. These results are of interest beyond the focus of this paper, such as in quantum metrology [46, 47].

CONNECTION BETWEEN $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ AND $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$

Proposition 4. Any state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ satisfies $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) = \bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) + 1/d$. Any measurement assemblage $\{M_{a|x}\}$ satisfies $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) = \bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) + 1$.

Proof. Let $\Delta_x = \mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a) - \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$. Calculation shows that Δ_x is independent of x,

$$
\Delta_x = \Delta := \frac{|1\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle \rho_B| + |\rho_B\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle 1|}{d} - \frac{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_B)}{d^2}(|1\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle 1|), \quad \mathrm{Tr}(\Delta_x) = \mathrm{Tr}(\Delta) = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_B)}{d} = \frac{1}{d}. \tag{S13}
$$

If $\mathcal{F} \ge \mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$ for all x, then $\mathcal{F} - \Delta \ge \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)$ for all x. So $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le \tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) - \mathrm{Tr}(\Delta) = \tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) - 1/d$. Similarly, we have the inequality $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \le \bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) + 1/d$. It follows that $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) = \bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) + 1/d$. The equality $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) = \bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) + 1$ follows from the same reasoning. □

PROOFS OF PROPOSITIONS 1 AND 2

In this section we prove Propositions 1 and 2 in the main text, which are needed for determining maximally steerable assemblages.

Proof of Proposition 1. According to Lemma S3 below, $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) \leq \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{I}) = d^2$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \leq \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{\mathbf{I}}) = d^2 - 1$. Here $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity superoperator and $\bar{\mathbf{I}}$ is the projector onto the space of traceless operators. By the same token,

$$\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \leq \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}) = d\,\mathrm{tr}(\rho_B) = d, \quad \bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \leq \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{\mathbf{I}}\mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}\bar{\mathbf{I}}) = \frac{(d^2-1)\,\mathrm{tr}(\rho_B)}{d} = d - \frac{1}{d}, \tag{S14}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}$ is defined as in Eq. (5) in the main text. However, $\bar{\mathbf{I}}\mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}\bar{\mathbf{I}}$ is in general not equal to $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\rho_B}$ in Eq. (5). □

Remark S5. According to Proposition 4, the upper bound in $\tau(\{M_{a|x}\}) \leq d^2$ is saturated if and only if the upper bound in $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \leq d^2 - 1$ is saturated. Similarly, the two upper bounds in $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \leq d$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \leq d - 1/d$ are simultaneously saturated or not.

Proof of Proposition 2. According to Lemma S4 below and Eq. (3) in the main text, $\bar{\tau}(\{M_{a|x}\}) \leq \sum_x \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{M_{a|x}\}_a)) \leq m(d-1)$. The first inequality is saturated if and only if the POVMs in the assemblage are mutually orthogonal, and the second is saturated if and only if all the POVMs have rank 1. The same proof applies to state assemblages. □

In the rest of this section we prove the two auxiliary lemmas needed in the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2.

Lemma S3. Any POVM $\{M_a\}$ satisfies $\mathcal{G}(\{M_a\}) \leq \mathbf{I}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{M_a\}) \leq \bar{\mathbf{I}}$. Any ensemble $\{\rho_a\}$ for the state ρ_B satisfies $\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_a\}) \leq \mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_a\}) \leq \bar{\mathbf{I}}\mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}\bar{\mathbf{I}}$.

Remark S6. The bounds in the lemma are closely related to the quantum Cramér-Rao bound based on the symmetric logarithmic derivative [29, 33].

Proof. Let C be an arbitrary Hermitian operator. Then

$$\langle\!\langle C|\mathcal{G}(\{M_a\})|C\rangle\!\rangle = \sum_a \frac{\langle\!\langle C|M_a\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle M_a|C\rangle\!\rangle}{\mathrm{tr}(M_a)} = \sum_a \frac{\left[\mathrm{tr}\left(CM_a^{1/2}M_a^{1/2}\right)\right]^2}{\mathrm{tr}(M_a)} \leq \sum_a \mathrm{tr}(C^2 M_a) = \mathrm{tr}(C^2), \tag{S15}$$

which implies that $\mathcal{G}(\{M_a\}) \leq \mathbf{I}$. Conjugation by $\bar{\mathbf{I}}$ yields $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{M_a\}) \leq \bar{\mathbf{I}}$. By the same token, we have

$$\langle\!\langle C|\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_a\})|C\rangle\!\rangle \leq \mathrm{tr}(C^2\rho_B) = \langle\!\langle C|\mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}|C\rangle\!\rangle, \tag{S16}$$

which implies that $\mathcal{G}(\{\rho_a\}) \leq \mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_a\}) \leq \bar{\mathbf{I}}\mathcal{R}_{\rho_B}\bar{\mathbf{I}}$. □

Lemma S4. Any assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ satisfies

$$\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \leq \sum_x \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}_a)) = \sum_{a,x} \frac{\mathrm{tr}(\bar{\rho}_{a|x}^2)}{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_{a|x})}. \tag{S17}$$

The upper bound is saturated if and only if the ensembles in the assemblage are mutually orthogonal.

Lemma S4 is an immediate consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma S5. Suppose A_j are positive operators in dimension d and

$$t(\{A_j\}) := \min\{\mathrm{tr}(F) | F \geq A_j \ \forall j\}. \tag{S18}$$

Then $t(\{A_j\}) \leq \sum_j \mathrm{tr}(A_j)$ and the upper bound is saturated if and only if the A_j have mutually orthogonal support. In that case, the operator that attains the minimum in Eq. (S18) is unique and is equal to $\sum_j A_j$.

Proof. Let $C = \sum_j A_j$; then $C \geq A_j$ for all j. So

$$t(\{A_j\}) \leq \mathrm{tr}(C) = \sum_j \mathrm{tr}(A_j). \tag{S19}$$

Let E be an operator that attains the minimum in Eq. (S18), P_j the projector onto the support of A_j, and $P^\perp$ the projector onto the kernel of $\sum_j A_j$. If the A_j are mutually orthogonal, then the P_j are mutually orthogonal and orthogonal to $P^\perp$. In addition, $P^\perp + \sum_j P_j = 1$ and $P_j E P_j \geq P_j A_j P_j = A_j$, so that

$$t(\{A_j\}) = \mathrm{tr}(E) = \mathrm{tr}(P^\perp E P^\perp) + \sum_j \mathrm{tr}(P_j E P_j) \geq \sum_j \mathrm{tr}(P_j E P_j) \geq \sum_j \mathrm{tr}(A_j), \tag{S20}$$

which implies that $t(\{A_j\}) = \sum_j \mathrm{tr}(A_j)$ given Eq. (S19). Furthermore, saturating these inequalities implies that $P^\perp E P^\perp = 0$ and $P_j E P_j = A_j$ for all j. Given that $E - A_j$ is positive semidefinite for all j, we conclude that $P^\perp E P_j = P_j E P^\perp = 0$ for all j and $P_j E P_k = 0$ for all $j \neq k$. Consequently, $E = \sum_j P_j E P_j = \sum_j A_j$.

If two of the A_j, say A_1 and A_2, are not orthogonal, then there exists a (nonzero) positive operator B that satisfies $B \leq A_1$ and $B \leq A_2$. Let $C = \sum_j A_j - B$; then $C \geq A_j$ for all j. So

$$t(\{A_j\}) \leq \mathrm{tr}(C) = \sum_j \mathrm{tr}(A_j) - \mathrm{tr}(B) < \sum_j \mathrm{tr}(A_j). \tag{S21}$$

□

STEERING MEASURES UNDER TRANSPOSITION

Here we show that $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ and $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ are invariant under transposition of $\rho_{a|x}$.

Lemma S6.

$$\tau(\{\rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}\}) = \tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}), \quad \bar{\tau}(\{\rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}\}) = \bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}). \tag{S22}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a superoperator that satisfies $\mathcal{F} \geq \mathcal{G}(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ for all x and that $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{F}) = \tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$. Decompose $\mathcal{F}$ as $\mathcal{F} = \sum_j r_j(|R_j\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle R_j|)$ and let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{T}} = \sum r_j(|R_j^{\mathrm{T}}\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle R_j^{\mathrm{T}}|)$. Then we have

$$\sum_j r_j(|R_j\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle R_j|) \geq \sum_a \frac{|\rho_{a|x}\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle \rho_{a|x}|}{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_{a|x})} \quad \forall x, \tag{S23}$$

which implies that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{T}} \geq \sum_a \frac{|\rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle \rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}|}{\mathrm{tr}(\rho_{a|x})} = \mathcal{G}(\{\rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}\}_a) \quad \forall x. \tag{S24}$$

Therefore, $\tau(\{\rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}\}) \leq \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{T}}) = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{F}) = \tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$. By symmetry we also have $\tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) \leq \tau(\{\rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}\})$. It follows that $\tau(\{\rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}\}) = \tau(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$. The equality $\bar{\tau}(\{\rho^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x}\}) = \bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\})$ follows from the same reasoning. □

STEERABILITY OF ISOTROPIC STATES

Consider a family isotropic states in dimension $d \times d$ parametrized by the parameter α with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$,

$$\rho(\alpha) = (1-\alpha)\frac{1}{d^2} + \alpha|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|, \tag{S25}$$

where $|\Phi\rangle = (\sum_j |jj\rangle)/\sqrt{d}$. Suppose Alice has the measurement assemblage $\{A_{a|x}\}$; then Bob has the state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|x}\}$ with

$$\rho_{a|x} = \mathrm{tr}_A[(A_{a|x} \otimes 1)\rho(\alpha)] = \frac{1}{d}\Big[\alpha A^{\mathrm{T}}_{a|x} + \frac{1-\alpha}{d}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_{a|x})\Big], \tag{S26}$$

which may be seen as a coarse graining of the assemblage $\{A_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}/d\}$. Calculation shows that

$$\bar{\tau}(\{\rho_{a|x}\}) = \frac{\alpha^2}{d}\bar{\tau}(\{A_{a|x}^{\mathrm{T}}\}) = \frac{\alpha^2}{d}\bar{\tau}(\{A_{a|x}\}), \tag{S27}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma S6. The isotropic state is steerable with respect to $\{A_{a|x}\}$ when $\alpha^2\bar{\tau}(\{A_{a|x}\}) > (d-1)$. If the measurement assemblage for Alice is composed of m MUB, then $\bar{\tau}(\{A_{a|x}\}) = m(d-1)$, so the isotropic state is steerable if $m\alpha^2 > 1$. In the case of two qubits, this condition turns out to be both sufficient and necessary [14, 19]. Note that a two-qubit isotropic state is equivalent to a Werner state under a local unitary transformation.